



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 15, 2004

Mr. Mark G. Mann
Assistant City Attorney
City of Garland
P. O. Box 469002
Garland, Texas 75046-9002

OR2004-8792

Dear Mr. Mann:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 210896.

The Garland Police Department (the "department") received two requests, from the same requestor, for information related a specific automobile/bicycle collision. You state that the department has released a portion of the requested information. You further state that the department has forwarded the requested DWI video tape to the Dallas County District Attorney's Office, and the video tape is no longer in the department's possession.¹ You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses the common law right to privacy, which protects information if it is highly intimate or embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and the public has no legitimate interest in it. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus.*

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to obtain information not in its possession in response to a records request. Open Records Decision No. 445 (1986), 317 (1982). So long as the department does not have a right of access to the videotape at this time, *see* Open Records Decision No. 462 at 4 (1987), then the department does not "maintain" the tape for purposes of the Act and the department need not comply with this portion of the records request.

Accident Bd., 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Where an individual's criminal history information has been compiled by a governmental entity, the information takes on a character that implicates the individual's right to privacy. See *United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989). However, information that refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not private under *Reporters Committee* and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. In addition, when a requestor asks for information relating to a particular incident, the request does not implicate the privacy concerns expressed in *Reporters Committee* because complying with the request does not require the governmental body to compile unspecified records.

In this instance, the requestor specifies the incident for which information is being sought. Because the request does not ask the department to compile unspecified criminal records regarding an individual, we find that the privacy concerns expressed in *Reporters Committee* are not implicated by this request. Therefore, none of the requested information may be withheld under section 552.101 on the basis of the holding in *Reporters Committee*.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. See *Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. See Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." See Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing WIGMORE, EVIDENCE, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make the initial report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege.

You seek to withhold the information that you have highlighted in purple under the informer's privilege. You state that this information identifies an individual who provided information to the department regarding alleged crimes. In this instance, however, the submitted information identifies the individual in question as a witness. You do not inform us, and it is not otherwise clear to this office, that this individual actually reported any crime to the department. We therefore conclude that the department may not withhold any of the

information that is highlighted in purple under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.²

For information you have highlighted in yellow, as well as for the submitted 911 audio tape and the photographs, you raise section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the information at issue relates to a pending criminal investigation and that a charge of intoxication assault has been filed with the Dallas County District Attorney's Office. Based upon this representation, we conclude that release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Accordingly, you may withhold the yellow highlighted information based on section 552.108(a)(1).

For information you have highlighted in green, you raise section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 provides in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

- (1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]
- (2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

We agree that you must withhold the green-highlighted information based section 552.130.

To summarize, you may withhold the yellow highlighted information and the 911 audio tape and photographs under section 552.108(a)(1). You must withhold the green-highlighted

²We note that you also claim the informer's privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 508. The Texas Supreme Court has held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022 [of the Government Code]." *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). In this instance, however, section 552.022 is not applicable to the information that you seek to withhold under the informer's privilege, and therefore we do not address your arguments under rule 508.

information based section 552.130. All remaining information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this

ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cary Grace", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Cary Grace
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ECG/krl

Ref: ID#210896

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Adam R. Hardison
Rad Law Firm
12900 Preston Road, Suite 900
Dallas, Texas 75230-1325
(w/o enclosures)